G. R. S. 59] GPB—15,000—20-12-13

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1899-00
~~191~~ .
(Military)

File No. 210 of 99-00

Serial Nos. 1-10.

~~Papers Filed.~~ B.

Month January 00.

Mr. S. Krishna Rao

SUBJECT.

Appeal of M. Nanjaraj urs against his dismissal

PREVIOUS REFERENCES.	LATER REFERENCES.
Inter mediate papers G. O. Nos. 199 of 99-00.	

1 V Do. 44
1 Rib.

MEMORANDUM.
MILITARY DEPARTMENT.

Mily
2106 99-00

TO THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
FOR ORDERS.

DATED 5th March 1901.

Subject

Offg. Dewan's endorsement on a petition from M.Nunjaraj Urs .

This Officer was dismissed ~~the~~ for service by Court Martial.

His conduct had been previously unsatisfactory.

The file relating to his case is put up . You will see that he has been found insubordi-nate.

Like many men of his class he fills his petitions with accu-sations against his late brother Officers but has brought nothing to refute the charges made against himself.

It would be extremely sub-versive of discipline to inter-fere in any way with his case. now that the proceedings of the Court have been confirmed nd I do not think there is the slight-est doubt that he wasguilty of the charge brought against him.

Sd. R.F. Jones 5/3

+8

16

SECTION Duty
210 & 99-00
FILE No. ~~199 & 99-00~~

To

Mayor No. 1 R. G. Jones:
Military Secretary.

Your humble and obedient petitioner most respectfully begs to state that he has been dismissed from service on the false report of the Regimentdar, that he failed to discharge his day duty on the 30th July 1899.

Your humble petitioner ventures to submit that he is not guilty as alleged by the Regt.dar. and his dismissal has been brought about by the prejudice entertained against him by the Regt.dar as will appear from the following facts.

I. When H. H. the Maharaja visited the lines in July last for inspection, he very graciously condescended to enter your petitioner's dwelling. Your petitioner, as is customary in such cases, which is well known to your gracious Highness, offerred fruits and flowers, for H. H's kind acceptance. The Regt.dar on this occasion forbade him to do any such thing; but your petitioner thought he would be failing in his duty if he did not do the customary Rajapuja notwithstanding the contravention.

Nothing to do with the charge

II. The New Lines at Hebbal were occupied in September 1898. Your petitioner begs to state that the Regtdar forcibly and unjustly took possession of the house allotted to him, without providing him with another; but he exacted rent for the said house, till March last, when, after repeated requests, he was given a house, the ad-interim rents paid not being refunded.

rents should be refunded &c

III. That in an enquiry charging the Resaldar Mir Mayanuddin with having

dishonestly exacted excess pay.s from the Lowars as cost of grass, your petitioner was asked by the Commission to produce the accounts in his possession. This along with the evidence of others showed that the said Resaldar received Rs 211 in excess from the men of the Regt. In this he was asked by the Regtdar to alter the accounts produced by him. but his failing to alter the said record increased the hatred between them.

4. That Resaldar Mer Moyeenuddin went on leave without handing over cash balance to your petitioner's charge in February 1898. and hence there was delay in paying the men. This fact your petitioner reported to the Regt.dar as an explanation of the delay. The Resaldar being the Regtdar's kinsman. no notice was taken of the irregularity. and the report made by your petitioner was hushed up.

Among others the following are the few instances of the unlawful acts and irregularities of the Regtdar of which documentary proofs are available in the records of the Office.

5. As a Resaldar in 1895 the Regtdar falsely reported that he was entitled to 3 months privilege leave and had it granted. His then superior, also a Mahomedan by name Mahomed Yusuf. came to know of it subsequently; but being his kinsman he took no action on such a serious fault.

6. The Regtdar's uncle Syed Rarah. was very lately granted furlough leave against the rules of the Standing Orders

XV
5

12. When Resaldar Mir Moyeenuddin acted for Resaldar Syed Abdul Rahiman. Complaint was brought by the Sowars against this acting man that he had exacted excess of payment from them as Cost of grass. In the enquiry held it was proved that the said Mir Moyeenuddin did really receive Rs 2 1/- in excess from the men. But the excess amount paid by the men was merely returned to them and the case compromised and no proper steps were taken in this serious case also. And the same acting man was also allowed by the Regtdar to draw the Squadron allowance before inspection by the Chief Commdt on the mere order that he would sanction the same after inspecting the Squadron. The Regtdar omitted to take proper steps in the one case and made a false report that the acting Resaldar had done his duty satisfactorily in the other, and thus enabled him to draw the acting allowances, while he was in fact found in the enquiry held to have illegally exacted excess of payment from the Sowars.

Para 3 a/c

13. Jemadars Syed Buddan & Gulam Mustapa brothers of the Regtdar, (Resaldar Chitumdara Rao) were formerly degraded for their official misconduct from the grade of Duffedars to that of Silledars. but the Regtdar has intentionally failed to bring this fact to the notice of

the Superiors in order to get them the successive promotions.

14. The Arrn compensation for a few months of 1893 has not yet been distributed, to the men of the Regt. A mere glance at the cash Book for those months conclusively proves this fact. Is this true?

15. In contravension of the Section System now in force, horses have been let to people unconnected with the Regt. all relatives or favourites of the Regt dar. And the rent received from such of the occupants of the Regtal Quarters has not been since September 1898 paid to the Govt. Documentary evidence of the fact can be had from the Squadron Rent lists.

16. Any order of the commanding Offrs must be entered in the Regtal Order Book and should be sent round to the Officers for information. They should acknowledge receipt of the Orders of the Comdg Officer in the book so sent, by their signature, and execute them. Besides this an Officer should be informed of his duty by the Duffedar Major who should orally repeat the orders of the Comdg Officer. This System has been in existence for the last 2 years and the orders in writing of the Commanding Officer are that on the 30th July, the day on

26

To. the. D. O.

9

Please read & favor the Demans with your opinion on the matters brought to notice

As regards the petitioner's own case he has brought forward nothing to refute the charges of which he has been found guilty.

23/9/99. (Sd) R.G. Jones major
Mily. asst.

27

to 17

SECTION Mily
Endorsement No 581
FILE NO. ~~1099-00~~ 2100 99-00
SUB ~~12~~ 2

Inm. M. Nanyaya Mrs is informed without date with reference to his petition that he brings forward no facts to disprove the charges of which he has been found guilty and Govt see no grounds for any interference in his case.

R.G. Jones major
Mily. asst

Mily. asst's office.
Dy. 27th September 99. RL

No. Pol dated 29/9/99 342

I recommend to the Military Secretary's favourable consideration

Secretary's Office dated 23/9/99

28

1/18 683

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.
PETITION DEPARTMENT.
REG'D. NO. 683 P
DATE 23-9-99

SECTION Mily

FILE No. 210 of 99-00 ~~199 of 99 00~~

SER'AL No. 915 P.

To

Sir K. Sheshadri Iyer
K.C.S.I. Dewan of Mysore.

Your most humble and obedient petitioner most respectfully begs to state that he has been dismissed from service on the false report of the Regimentdar, that he failed to discharge his day duty on the 30th July 1899.

Your humble petitioner ventures to submit that he is not guilty, as alleged by the Regimentdar and his dismissal has been brought about by the prejudice entertained aginst him by the Regimentdar as will appear from the following facts:

1. When H. H. the Maharaja visited the Lines in July last for inspection, he very graciously condescended to enter your petitioner's dwelling. Your petitioner as is customary in such cases which is well-known to your gracious Highness offerred fruits and flowers for His Highness' kind acceptance. The Regimentdar on this occasion forbade him to do any such thing; but your petitioner thought he would be failing in this duty towards his Soverign if he did not do the customary Rajpuja notwithstanding the contravention.

2. The new lines at Hebbal were occupied in September 1899. Your petitioner begs to state that the Regimentdar forcibly and unjustly took possession of the house allotted to him without providing him with another; but he exacted rent for the said house till March last, when, after repeated requests, he was given a house the *ad interim* rents paid not being refunded.

3. That in an enquiry charging the Resaldar Mir Moyeenuddin with having dishonestly exacted excess payment from the Sowars as cost of grass, your petitioner was asked by the commission to produce the accounts in his possession. This along with the evidence of others showed that the said Resaldar had received Rs. 211 in excess from the men of the Regiment. In this he was asked by Regimentdar to vary the accounts produced by him but his failing to alter the said record increased the hatred between them.

4. That Resaldar Mir Moyeenuddin went on leave without handing over the cash balance to your petitioner's charge in February 1898 and hence there was delay in paying the men. This fact your petitioner reported to the Regimentdar as an explanation of the delay. The Resaldar being the Regimentdar's kinsman, no notice was taken of the irregularity and the report made by your petitioner was hushed up.

Among others the following are the few instances of the unlawful acts and irregularities of the Regimentdar, of which documentary proofs are available in the records of the office.

5. As a Resaldar in 1895 the Regimentdar falsely reported that he was entitled to 3 months' privilege leave and had it granted. His then superior, also a Mahomedan by name Mahamed Esuf came to know of it subsequently; but being his kinsman, he took no action on such a serious fault.

6. The Regimentdar's uncle Syed Rarah has very lately been granted furlough leave against the rules of the standing orders—and that, even though he was not entitled therefor.

His other relatives have the same favors granted unlawfully.

7. His brother Jamedar Syed Buddan took leave and went away without handing over the charge of cash balance money to Jamedar Kande Rao. The latter accordingly reported against the irregularity and again no notice has been taken of the said misconduct.

8. Resaldar Murad Beg was ordered in June last to immediately hand over the charge of the cash money to Resaldar Chidambar Rao. In spite of such an order the charge was not handed over till July last though the latter reported three or four times against this serious failure to execute the order without delay. And again nothing was done even in this case though the man legally deserved dismissal in addition to a criminal prosecution.

9. Jamedar Syed Buddan and Ghulam Dastagir both kinsmen of the Regimentdar went on plague duty in November 1898 to Seringapatam without handing over the charge of the cash money to the acting successor Syed Futtulla. Reports were made to the Regimentdar against this misconduct by the acting Jamedar. No steps were taken to correct the procedure of the two Jamedars and therefore the acting man refused to sign the cash book daily till their return in March 1899. And the misconduct of the 2 Jamedars was not only not brought to the official notice of the higher authorities by the Regimentdar but he also encouraged them to sign the cash book after their return for daily cash during four months of their absence.

The Regimentdar intentionally omitted to bring them to justice.

10. The Regimentdar drew Rs. 90 a month that being the pay of T. Nanjaraj Urs from December 1898 to April 1899, but paid him only Rs. 80 a month during the said period. And from May 1899 the Regimentdar drew Rs. 100 a month to which the said Nanjaraja Urs was entitled according to the then new Proceedings, paying him at Rs. 90 a month using the balance towards the illegal payment to his brother Jamedar Syed Buddan and others.

11. The Regimentdar in contravention of the Regulations in force permitted his own men to take their horses with them when going on leave, to places connected by Railway, in May last. The rule being that no horse shall be taken by any sowar going on leave and no officer shall take his horse to places connected by Railway. He also allowed them to exceed the maximum rate of 15 miles a day as fixed in the Regulations.

12. When Resaldar Mir Moyeenuddin acted for Resaldar, Syed Abdulla Rahemam, complaint was brought by the Sowars against the acting man that he had

Box
13:1

exacted excess of payment from them as cost of grass. In the enquiry held it was proved that the said Mir Moyeenudin did really receive Rs. 211 in excess from the men. But the excess amount paid by the men was merely returned to them and the case compromised and no proper steps were taken in this serious case also. And the same acting man was also allowed by the Regimentdar to draw the squadron allowance before inspection by the Chief Commandant on the mere order that he would sanction the same after inspecting the squadron. The Regimentdar omitted to take proper steps in the one case and made a false report that the acting Resaldar had done his duty satisfactorily in the other and thus enabled him to draw the acting allowances while he was in fact found, in the enquiry held, to have illegally exacted excess of payment from the Sowars.

13. Jemadars Syed Buddan and Gulam Dastagir brothers of the Regimentdar (Resaldar Chitumbara Rao) were formerly degraded for their official misconduct from the grade of Daffedars to that of Silledars. But the Regimentdar has intentionally failed to bring this fact to the notice of the superiors in order to get them the successive promotions.

14. The gram compensation for a few months of 1893 has not yet been distributed to the men of the regiment. A mere glance at the cash book for those months conclusively proves this fact.

15. In contravention of the section system now in force, houses have been let to people unconnected with the regiment all relatives or favorites of the Regimentdar. And the rent received from such of the occupants of the regimental quarters has not been since September 1898 paid to the Government. Documentary evidence of the fact can be had from the squadron rent-lists.

16. Any order of the Commanding Officer must be entered on the regimental order-book and should be sent round to the officers for information. They should acknowledge the receipt of the orders of the Commanding Officer in the book so sent by their signature and execute them. Besides this an officer should be informed of his duty by the Daffedar Major, who should orally repeat the Orders of the Commanding officer. This system has been in existence for the last 20 years and the orders in writing of the Commanding Officer are that on the 30th July the day on which the day Officer should be Jamadar Khande Rao, and the Officer in waiting Syed Buddan. I am charged with having failed to do the day-officers' duty on the said 30th July while it is evident from the written orders of the Commanding Offcer that on that day the Jamedar Khande Rao and Syed Buddan should appear on duty and not I. Without investigating the case properly and suppressing the real state of affairs they submitted a false report and got me dismissed.

The fact is that Jamedar Khande Rao and Syed Buddan had to perform their respective duties on the 30th July but they absented themselves. To save these the Regimentdar came to their aid and said that they were granted leave. No written record of the grant of leave exists. No written report was submitted to the Regimentdar by the said officers for leave, nor has the Regimentdar power to grant any such leave unless the report for leave comes to him through the squadron Com-

mander in the orderly room. Hence it will appear that in contravention of the rules in force, the Regimentdar, according to his false report against me, granted them leave and unjustly brought about my dismissal.

In this case particular attention is invited to the Regimental order book and Regimentdars' and Adjutants' sheet Roll.

The Regimentdar has lately disobeyed the Government orders to perform the escorting duty of His Highness the Maharaja and Her Highness the Maharani Regent on the 18th Instant. The humble petitioner's fault was not greater than the Regimentdar's wilful disobedience of the Government orders.

17. In conclusion your humble petitioner begs to add that the regulations in force have been understood by few of the regiment and the officers that sit in a Court-Martial neither know the regulations fully nor can they understand them, nearly all being illiterate, and this is apparent from their unjust dicision in your humble petitioner's case.

Begging that after kind enquiries and due consideration justice may be shewn and that your humble petitioner be restored to his office,

he most respectfully begs to remain,

most humble and

Obedient servant

M. NANJARAJA URS.

V. B. Soobbiah & Sons, Bangalore.—1899.

Gen. 28.

1899 15/9

From

SECTION Mily
210 & 99-00 To
FILE No. 1998 99-00

The Secretary to the Govt of Mysore Rev & Genl Depts Bangalore

Dated

Despatched 7 October

Received

General No. 536

No.

Enclosure No. /

Sir

I acknowledge receipt of your No. Pat 342 of the 29/30 ultimo,

I have the honor to forward

ıtral Jail Press, Bangalore.—5-10-98.—80,502.

66 34

SECTION Mily
2106 99-00
FILE NO. ~~4999900~~
SERIAL NO. ~~15~~ 5

Regd No 545
18.10.99
20

To

Major R. G. Jones
Military Secretary

Your most humble and obedient petitioner most respectfully begs to state that he has been dismissed from service on the false report of the Regimentdar, that he failed to discharge his day duty on the 30th July 1899.

Your humble petitioner ventures to submit that he is not guilty, as alleged by the Regimentdar and his dismissal has been brought about by the prejudice entertained aginst him by the Regimentdar as will appear from the following facts :

1. When H. H. the Maharaja visited the Lines in July last for inspection, he very graciously condescended to enter your petitioner's dwelling. Your petitioner as is customary in such cases which is well-known to your gracious Highness offerred fruits and flowers for His Highness' kind acceptance. The Regimentdar on this occasion forbade him to do any such thing; but your petitioner thought he would be failing in this duty towards his Soverign if he did not do the customary Rajpuja notwithstanding the contravention.

2. The new lines at Hebbal were occupied in September 1899. Your petitioner begs to state that the Regimentdar forcibly and unjustly took possession of the house allotted to him without providing him with another; but he exacted rent for the said house till March last, when, after repeated requests, he was given a house the *ad interim* rents paid not being refunded.

3. That in an enquiry charging the Resaldar Mir Moyeenuddin with having dishonestly exacted excess payment from the Sowars as cost of grass, your petitioner was asked by the commission to produce the accounts in his possession. This along with the evidence of others showed that the said Resaldar had received Rs. 211 in excess from the men of the Regiment. In this he was asked by Regimentdar to vary the accounts produced by him but his failing to alter the said record increased the hatred between them.

4. That Resaldar Mir Moyeenuddin went on leave without handing over the cash balance to your petitioner's charge in February 1898 and hence there was delay in paying the men. This fact your petitioner reported to the Regimentdar as an explanation of the delay. The Resaldar being the Regimentdar's kinsman, no notice was taken of the irregularity and the report made by your petitioner was hushed up.

Among others the following are the few instances of the unlawful acts and irregularities of the Regimentdar, of which documentary proofs are available in the records of the office.

5. As a Resaldar in 1895 the Regimentdar falsely reported that he was entitled to 3 months' privilege leave and had it granted. His then superior, also a Mahomedan by name Mahamed Esuf came to know of it subsequently; but being his kinsman, he took no action on such a serious fault.

6. The Regimentdar's uncle Syed Rarah has very lately been granted furlough leave against the rules of the standing orders—and that, even though he was not entitled therefor.

His other relatives have the same favors granted unlawfully.

7. His brother Jamedar Syed Buddan took leave and went away without handing over the charge of cash balance money to Jamedar Kande Rao. The latter accordingly reported against the irregularity and again no notice has been taken of the said misconduct.

8. Resaldar Murad Beg was ordered in June last to immediately hand over the charge of the cash money to Resaldar Chidambar Rao. In spite of such an order the charge was not handed over till July last though the latter reported three or four times against this serious failure to execute the order without delay. And again nothing was done even in this case though the man legally deserved dismissal in addition to a criminal prosecution.

9. Jamedar Syed Buddan and Ghulam Dastagir both kinsmen of the Regimentdar went on plague duty in November 1898 to Seringapatam without handing over the charge of the cash money to the acting successor Syed Futtulla. Reports were made to the Regimentdar against this misconduct by the acting Jamedar. No steps were taken to correct the procedure of the two Jamedars and therefore the acting man refused to sign the cash book daily till their return in March 1899. And the misconduct of the 2 Jamedars was not only not brought to the official notice of the higher authorities by the Regimentdar but he also encouraged them to sign the cash book after their return for daily cash during four months of their absence.

The Regimentdar intentionally omitted to bring them to justice.

10. The Regimentdar drew Rs. 90 a month that being the pay of T. Nanjaraj Urs from December 1898 to April 1899, but paid him only Rs. 80 a month during the said period. And from May 1899 the Regimentdar drew Rs. 100 a month to which the said Nanjaraja Urs was entitled according to the then new Proceedings, paying him at Rs. 90 a month using the balance towards the illegal payment to his brother Jamedar Syed Buddan and others.

11. The Regimentdar in contravention of the Regulations in force permitted his own men to take their horses with them when going on leave, to places connected by Railway, in May last. The rule being that no horse shall be taken by any sowar going on leave and no officer shall take his horse to places connected by Railway. He also allowed them to exceed the maximum rate of 15 miles a day as fixed in the Regulations.

12. When Resaldar Mir Moyeenuddin acted for Resaldar, Syed Abdulla Raheman, complaint was brought by the Sowars against the acting man that he had

38 -

20

838

No Enc-1
F.86,98-99

Military Assistant's Office.

Dated Bangalore 17th November 1899.

SECTION Mily
210 of 99-00
FILE No. 199 of 99-00.

To

The Chief Commandant [illegible] 6

Mysore State Troops.

Sir,

In returning the petition from L.Munja raj Urs, late Jemadar of the Imperial Service Regiment, forwarded with our D.O. of the 15th instant, I am directed to request that you will kindly inform him that Government cannot reconsider the orders already passed on his case.

I have the honor to be

Sir,

your most obedient servant,

RL Jones Major

Military Assistant.

AC

T.S.R.

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT
REG'D. No. 924 OR
DATE 6-11-98

To,

RAJA DHARMA PRAVINA

T. R. A. THUMBOO CHETTY, ESQUIRE, C.I.E.,

SENIOR MEMBER OF THE COUNCIL

TO HER HIGHNESS THE MAHARANI REGENT,

MYSORE.

SECTION
FILE No.
SUB No.

MOST RESPECTED SIR,

Your humble petitioner begs to state that he was a jamadar in the Mysore Imperial Service Lancers and as such put in 5 years service in the same Regiment.

That he has been lately dismissed from service on the accusation that he failed to discharge his day duty on the 30th July, 1899 and that he thereby wilfully disobeyed the orders of the Regimentdar.

The circumstances of the case are as follows :—

In the Order Book of the date previous to 30th July, he had not been put down to do the day duty on the following day, nor was he to be in waiting. Two other officers, jamadar Khande Rao and Syed Budan, had to perform the duty. All of a sudden on that day a Silledar came and told the petitioner verbally that the Adjutant wanted him to do the day duty that day. As this was an unusual proceedure, your petitioner was surprised and naturally doubted the Silledar's word, as there were two officers put down for the duty in the Order Book. So the petitioner told the Silledar and asked him to bring a chit, and the Sowar did not come back. This is exactly what occured. The Dafedar Major who usually communicates such orders of Commanding Officer did not come, nor did the petitioner receive any order in writing which should naturally be expected when the order in the Order Book of the previous day was intended to be cancelled. As an officer in the Regiment, the petitioner was entited to a communication being properly sent to him and not through a Silledar. Your humble petitioner never even intended to disobey the orders of the Commanding Officer. He was only left in doubt by the sudden and unexpected communication of the Silledar, on whose failing to return with the chit asked for, the petitioner naturally concluded that one of the two officers put down in the Order Book had taken up the duty. These are all the facts, but unfortunately for the petitioner, these have been construed as wilful disobedience of the Commanding Officer's order, of which the petitioner begs to state he is entirely innocent, since he never intended to do any such thing as he has shown from the facts stated above.

Your humble petitioner further begs to bring to your kind notice, that the Military Regulations were brought into force only lately, that the trial by Court Martial is still in

its infancy, that most of the officers of the Regiment do not understand the law or the proceedure as they have no professional knowledge themselves and are not assisted by one with such, and that in consequence minor and serious offences are too often confounded with each other, and that the evidence of the accused and the witnesses are messed about, and not taken down in its entirety and that questions which should properly be referred for the decision of the Chief Commandant or Government, are not referred at all. Moreover, all the officers that formed the Court belong only to one Regiment and are under the Commanding Officer who complained, and the petitioner leaves it to your honor to infer the extent and the strength of the influence of such subordination on the decision of the Court. All these facts are stated by your humble petitioner from personal knowledge, and he is very much grieved to think that he should be the first unfortunate officer on whom these should tell—that a slight circumstance due partly to the neglect of the Regimental Staff should be so magnified as to award such a heavy punishment as that of dismissal of the petitioner from the service, although he was under the impression that he proved to the satisfaction of the Chief Commandant in his evidence in the priliminary investigation that the petitioner never intended to disobey the order of the Commanding Officer. That your petitioner is not of such disposition, but always supple and obedient, may also be known to LIEUTENANT COLONEL J. DESARAJ URS, Chief Commandant, under whom he had the honor of serving for 3 years when he was Commanding Officer of the Regiment.

In conclusion, your petitioner humbly and most respectfully prays that your honor will take into your kind and benevolent consideration the pitiful condition into which he is thrown by an unduly hard punishment dealt to him, and to move the Government to reinstate him in service and bestow an appointment either in the same Regiment or in the Local Service Regiment, for which act of kindness the petitioner as in duty bound shall for ever pray for your future prosperity and long life.

MYSORE,

Dated 2nd November, 1899.

He begs to remain

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

MUGOOR NANJARAJ URS.

MYSORE DEPARTMENTS OFFICE
PETITION ... MENT.
RECD ON 9688
DATE 13-11-99

To,

HIS EXCELLENCY RAJAIYADURANDRHARA.

SIR K. SHESHADRI IYER, ESQUIRE, K.C.S.I.,

DEWAN OF MYSORE.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY,

Your humble petitioner begs to state that he was a jamadar in the Mysore Imperial Service Lancers and as such put in 5 years service in the same Regiment.

That he has been lately dismissed from service on the accusation that he failed to discharge his day duty on the 30th July, 1899 and that he thereby wilfully disobeyed the orders of the Regimentdar.

The circumstances of the case are as follows :—

In the Order Book of the date previous to 30th July, he had not been put down to do the day duty on the following day, nor was he to be in waiting. Two other officers, jamadar Khande Rao and Syed Budan, had to perform the duty. All of a sudden on that day a Silledar came and told the petitioner verbally that the Adjutant wanted him to do the day duty that day. As this was an unusual proceedure, your petitioner was surprised and naturally doubted the Silledar's word, as there were two officers put down for the duty in the Order Book. So the petitioner told the Silledar and asked him to bring a chit, and the Sowar did not come back. This is exactly what occured. The Dafedar Major who usually communicates such orders of Commanding Officer did not come, nor did the petitioner receive any order in writing which should naturally be expected when the order in the Order Book of the previous day was intended to be cancelled. As an officer in the Regiment, the petitioner was entited to a communication being properly sent to him and not through a Silledar. Your humble petitioner never even intended to disobey the orders of the Commanding Officer. He was only left in doubt by the sudden and unexpected communication of the Silledar, on whose failing to return with the chit asked for, the petitioner naturally concluded that one of the two officers put down in the Order Book had taken up the duty. These are all the facts, but unfortunately for the petitioner, these have been construed as wilful disobedience of the Commanding Officer's order, of which the petitioner begs to state he is entirely innocent, since he never intended to do any such thing as he has shown from the facts stated above.

Your humble petitioner further begs to bring to your kind notice, that the Military Regulations were brought into force only lately, that the trial by Court Martial is still in

its infancy, that most of the officers of the Regiment do not understand the law or the procedure as they have no professional knowledge themselves and are not assisted by one with such, and that in consequence minor and serious offences are too often confounded with each other, and that the evidence of the accused and the witnesses are messed about, and not taken down in its entirety and that questions which should properly be referred for the decision of the Chief Commandant or Government, are not referred at all. Moreover, all the officers that formed the Court belong only to one Regiment and are under the Commanding Officer who complained, and the petitioner leaves it to your Excellency to infer the extent and the strength of the influence of such subordination on the decision of the Court. All these facts are stated by your humble petitioner from personal knowledge, and he is very much grieved to think that he should be the first unfortunate officer on whom these should tell—that a slight circumstance due partly to the neglect of the Regimental Staff should be so magnified as to award such a heavy punishment as that of dismissal of the petitioner from the service, although he was under the impression that he proved to the satisfaction of the Chief Commandant in his evidence in the priliminary investigation that the petitioner never intended to disobey the order of the Commanding Officer. That your petitioner is not of such disposition, but always supple and obedient, may also be known to LIEUTENANT COLONEL J. DESARAJ URS, Chief Commandant, under whom he had the honor of serving for 3 years when he was Commanding Officer of the Regiment.

In conclusion, your petitioner humbly and most respectfully prays that your Excellency will take into your kind and benevolent consideration the pitiful condition into which he is thrown by an unduly hard punishment dealt to him, and solicits orders to reinstate him in service and bestow an appointment either in the same Regiment or in the Local Service Regiment, for which act of kindness the petitioner as in duty bound shall for ever pray for your future prosperity and long life.

He begs to remain

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

MYSORE,

Dated 2 November, 1899.

MYSOOR NANJARAJ URS.

296-No 1028

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

No. Pet 681 PETITION DEPARTMENT.

25

SECTION Mily
210899-00
FILE No. 199899-00
SERIAL No. 19 9

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition

Registered No. 1348 dated 2nd September 1899

received at the Dewan's Office from Mr. Mugvar Ranjaram Urs, late Jemedar Imperial Service Lancers Mysore, praying that he may be reinstated in his former appointment or be given a suitable post in the Local Service Regiment

is forwarded, ~~together with~~ its enclosure, to the ~~Deputy Commissioner~~ transferred Military Assistant to the ~~District,~~ ~~for disposal.~~ Government of Mysore, in continuation of this office No. Pet 499 of 29th November 1899.

By order,

Secretary.

BANGALORE,
22 January 1900

Central Jail Press Bangalore-14-7-99—1,002.

Rec'd in a Registered cover by post 4/11/99

4/11/99

To,

P. N. KRISHNA MURTI, ESQUIRE, C.I.E.,

MEMBER OF THE COUNCIL

TO HER HIGHNESS THE MAHARANI—REGENT,

SECTION

FILE No.

No.

MYSORE.
MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT.
REG'D. No. 1348R
DATE 8—1—1900

MOST RESPECTED SIR,

Your humble petitioner begs to state that he was a jamadar in the Mysore Imperial Service Lancers and as such put in 5 years service in the same Regiment.

That he has been lately dismissed from service on the accusation that he failed to discharge his day duty on the 30th July, 1899 and that he thereby wilfully disobeyed the orders of the Regimentdar.

The circumstances of the case are as follows :—

In the Order Book of the date previous to 30th July, he had not been put down to do the day duty on the following day, nor was he to be in waiting. Two other officers, jamadar Khande Rao and Syed Budan, had to perform the duty. All of a sudden on that day a Silledar came and told the petitioner verbally that the Adjutant wanted him to do the day duty that day. As this was an unusual proceedure, your petitioner was surprised and naturally doubted the Silledar's word, as there were two officers put down for the duty in the Order Book. So the petitioner told the Silledar and asked him to bring a chit, and the Sowar did not come back. This is exactly what occured. The Dafedar Major who usually communicates such orders of Commanding Officer did not come, nor did the petitioner receive any order in writing which should naturally be expected when the order in the Order Book of the previous day was intended to be cancelled. As an officer in the Regiment, the petitioner was entited to a communication being properly sent to him and not through a Silledar. Your humble petitioner never even intended to disobey the orders of the Commanding Officer. He was only left in doubt by the sudden and unexpected communication of the Silledar, on whose failing to return with the chit asked for, the petitioner naturally concluded that one of the two officers put down in the Order Book had taken up the duty. These are all the facts, but unfortunately for the petitioner, these have been construed as wilful disobedience of the Commanding Officer's order, of which the petitioner begs to state he is entirely innocent, since he never intended to do any such thing as he has shown from the facts stated above.

Your humble petitioner further begs to bring to your kind notice, that the Military Regulations were brought into force only lately, that the trial by Court Martial is still in

its infancy, that most of the officers of the Regiment do not understand the law or the proceedure as they have no professional knowledge themselves and are not assisted by one with such, and that in consequence minor and serious offences are too often confounded with each other, and that the evidence of the accused and the witnesses are messed about, and not taken down in its entirety and that questions which should properly be referred for the decision of the Chief Commandant or Government, are not referred at all. Moreover, all the officers that formed the Court belong only to one Regiment and are under the Commanding Officer who complained, and the petitioner leaves it to your honor to infer the extent and the strength of the influence of such subordination on the decision of the Court. All these facts are stated by your humble petitioner from personal knowledge, and he is very much grieved to think that he should be the first unfortunate officer on whom these should tell—that a slight circumstance due partly to the neglect of the Regimental Staff should be so magnified as to award such a heavy punishment as that of dismissal of the petitioner from the service, although he was under the impression that he proved to the satisfaction of the Chief Commandant in his evidence in the priliminary investigation that the petitioner never intended to disobey the order of the Commanding Officer. That your petitioner is not of such disposition, but always supple and obedient, may also be known to LIEUTENANT COLONEL J. DESARAJ URS, Chief Commandant, under whom he had the honor of serving for 3 years when he was Commanding Officer of the Regiment.

In conclusion, your petitioner humbly and most respectfully prays that your honor will take into your kind and benevolent consideration the pitiful condition into which he is thrown by an unduly hard punishment dealt to him, and to move the Government to reinstate him in service and bestow an appointment either in the same Regiment or in the Local Service Regiment, for which act of kindness the petitioner as in duty bound shall for ever pray for your future prosperity and long life.

He begs to remain

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

MUGOOR NANJARAJ URS.

MYSORE,

Dated 2nd November, 1899.